

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-3, 11-14 and 28-33 are pending in the application and that claims 28-32 are rejected. By this response, claims 28-30 and 32 have been amended. Thus, claims 1-3, 11-14 and 28-33 are pending in the application.

Allowed and Allowable Claims

Applicant respectfully thanks the Examiner for the allowance of claims 1-3, 11-14 and 33. Furthermore, claim 30 has been amended to incorporate respective rejected base claims and any intervening claims and is now believed to be in allowable form. Furthermore, claim 32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as stated in the instant Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 32 has been amended to recite a "drive release mechanism."

Hence, Applicant asserts that claim 32 overcomes the §112, second paragraph, rejection, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C., §103

Claims 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arends, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 4,306,474), in view of *Wittek* (U.S. Patent No. 1,796,417). Independent claim 28 has been amended to include “a drive motor configured to move the treadle” and to further include a limitation providing for “an input signal from the article detector” that is received by the control circuitry to “control operation of the drive motor to controllably move the treadle to position the article relative to the punch and the die for synchronized severing of the article from the web.” Support for the amendment can be found at least at paragraph 19 and Figures 1 and 3. Furthermore, dependent claims 29 and 30 have been amended, respectively to include “a kinematic linkage coupled between the treadle and a platen that supports the punch” and “wherein the kinematic linkage comprises a rocker arm.” Support for these limitations can be found at least at paragraph 48 and Figure 1.

Hence, applicants assert that claims 28-32 overcome the obviousness rejection pursuant to the amendments made above.

Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If

Application Serial No. 10/788,849
Amendment dated 2/27/2008
in Response to Office Action dated 08/27/2007

the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance,
the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such
subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 2/27/08

By. 

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144